

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application. While no claims are amended hereby, Applicant has provided a listing of the claims for the convenience of the Examiner. Claims 1, 4-8, 10, and 13-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,597,956 to Aziz et al. (“Aziz”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,096,266 to Lewin et al. (“Lewin”). Claims 2-3, 9, 11-12, and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Aziz in view of Lewin and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,996,616 to Leighton et al. (“Leighton”). Applicant traverses and respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections.

Claims 1, 9-10, and 18 are independent. Each of the independent claims recite “a shared cache server being placed on a common network . . . a plurality of groups [], comprising: **a storage device to store contents in each of a plurality of storage areas allocated corresponding to said plurality of groups.**” As fully explained in Applicant’s November 7, 2007 Response, Aziz fails to teach these limitations. In response to the Applicant’s arguments, the Office Action now newly cites Figure 9, column 14, lines 24-28 and 46-50, and column 29, lines 46-49 against this limitation. That said, it is unclear how the Office Action is applying the Aziz reference. For example, what does the Office Action consider to be the claimed “storage device?” The Virtual Server Farm (“VSF 906”)? Farm manager (912)? The Computing Grid (904)? The Office Action does not say.

Nonetheless, Aziz, as newly cited against this limitation, still fails. First, Figure 9 shows that the Farm Managers are in control plane 902, which controls and manages computing, network and storage elements contained in the Computing Grid 904. See column 14, lines 19-28. As explained in the previous response, Aziz’s VSF would not accommodate a shared cache server with “a plurality of storage areas allocated corresponding to said plurality of groups,” as Aziz’s servers must be committed to a single group - a VSF. The Farm Managers establish, configure and maintain VSFs on the computer grid. Nothing in Aziz indicates that the Farm Managers, or any given Farm Manager is acting as “a storage device to store contents in each of a plurality of storage areas allocated corresponding to said plurality of groups.” Indeed, Aziz is silent as to the configuration of storage in any of the Farm Managers. At best Aziz shows that a Farm Manager

establishes and manages a VSF, or that multiple Farm Managers establish and manage multiple VSFs. Aziz is silent on one shared storage configuration of the Farm Managers. Similarly, Aziz is silent on any shared storage configuration of its VSFs .

Thus, for the reasons laid out in the November Response and above, Aziz fails to show “a storage area to store contents in each of a plurality of storage areas allocated corresponding to said plurality of groups,” as required by independent claims 1, 9-10, and 18.

As nothing in Lewin or Leighton cures the deficiency of Aziz as applied to the independent claims, Applicant urges that independent claims 1, 9-10, and 18 are presently in condition for allowance and urge reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections thereto. Moreover, as the remaining claims depend from independent claims 1, 9-10, and 18, and as nothing in Lewin or Leighton cure the deficiency of Aziz as applied to the independent claims, Applicant urges that all the claims are in condition for allowance and urge reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections thereto.

In view of the above amendment, Applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

No fee is believed to be due for this Amendment. Should any fees be required, please charge such fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2215.

Dated: February 11, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

By /Brian M. McGuire/
Brian M. McGuire (Registration No.: 55,445)
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1177 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-2714
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicant